

REMARKS

The undersigned thanks Examiner Nakarani for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview of April 26, 2006. During the interview, the undersigned proposed that Applicants intend to add the limitation of claim 16, i.e., wherein said metal-containing layer has an optical density of about 1.5 to 5.0, in independent claims 1 and 24 to overcome the pending rejections. As claim 16 has not been rejected as being anticipated by Murai, the undersigned explained that the proposed amendments should overcome the anticipation rejection. The Examiner agreed.

Also, the undersigned explained that persons of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that a “high transparency” film such as that of Murai’s would have an optical density of close to zero. The Examiner suggested that Applicants should submit a Declaration stating that Murai’s “high transparency” film would have an optical density of close to zero and explaining why it would be so. The Examiner also suggested canceling the withdrawn claims. The present Amendment and the accompanying Declaration of Mr. Keunsuk P. Chang have been prepared in light of the Examiner’s suggestions during the interview.¹

Applicants thank the Examiner for withdrawing the rejections in the Action of July 19, 2005, in light of the Amendment filed October 24, 2005.

Claims 1-5, 10-12, 15, 18-20, 24 and 25 were rejected as being anticipated by Murai. This rejection is respectfully traversed and should be withdrawn as independent claims 1 and 24 now contain the limitation of claim 16 that the metal-containing layer has an optical density of about 1.5 to 5.0.

Claims 1-20, 24 and 25 were rejected as being obvious over Murai in view of Sawada, Lee and Hofmeister. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

¹ During the interview, the undersigned also inquired if the Examiner would enter the Declaration and amendments adding the limitation of claim 16 in claims 1 and 24 even though the present response is to a final Action. The Examiner said that he would enter both the Rule 131 Declaration and the amendments to the claims as made in the present Amendment as they do not raise new issues.

The Examiner has stated that "Murai et al' film has *high transparency* (Col. 6, lines 24-25). Therefor[e] [the] claimed optical density [is] deemed to be inherent unless shown otherwise." Please see page 3, lines 5 and 6 of the Action; emphasis added. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's argument regarding inherency is incorrect as Murai's high transparency film has an optical density of close to zero as explained in the Declaration of Mr. Keunsuk P. Chang, enclosed herewith. This fact would be well-known to persons of ordinary skill in the art who would immediately recognize that as the measurement of optical density is based on the amount of light transmittance through the sample, a high transparency film like Murai's has almost 100% light transmittance, and therefore close to zero optical density.

Sawada, Lee and Hofmeister have been cited for reasons other than for that the metal-containing layer has an optical density of about 1.5 to 5.0. In short, none of the cited references disclose that the metal-containing layer has an optical density of about 1.5 to 5.0. Thus, the prior art references fail to teach this limitation *as a whole*.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal form is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing 361752002400.

Dated: April 28, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Raj S. Dave

Registration No.: 42,465

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300

McLean, Virginia 22102

(703) 760-7755 – Telephone

(703) 760-7777 - Facsimile